



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE



In Reply refer to:

Klamath Falls Fish and Wildlife Office
6610 Washburn Way
Klamath Falls, Oregon 97603
(541) 885-8481 FAX (541) 885-7837

To: All Parties Interested in Submitting Watershed Restoration Proposals for the Hatfield Restoration Program

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – Klamath Basin Ecosystem Restoration Office (KBERO) invites pre-proposals for actions to recover listed species, ecosystem restoration and improving reliability of water deliveries in the Upper Klamath Basin, Oregon and California. The Service may provide funds for this work to public agencies, for-profit and non-profit organizations, Native American tribes, and individuals. Private landowners interested in small restoration projects are encouraged to consider the Small Grants Partnership Program. Funding is anticipated at approximately \$2.0 million for on-the-ground restoration projects, \$350,000 for research and assessment proposals, and \$100,000 for the Small Grants Partnership Program. The RFP is available on the internet at: <http://klamathfallsfwo.fws.gov/ero/rfp2006.html> or at KBERO. Pre-proposals are due **November 10, 2005**.

Watershed restoration work is part of the Hatfield Restoration Program authorized by Congress in 1996. It is administered by the KBERO, with guidance provided by the Upper Klamath Basin Working Group (Hatfield Committee) and the Hatfield Restoration Science Team, which is composed of representatives from resource agencies, tribes and interest groups. The Science Team has drafted a 5-Year Plan for Restoration of the Upper Klamath Basin (Appendix 1). The emphasis in 2006 is on the recovery of endangered Lost River and shortnose suckers, and the habitat upon which they depend, particularly around Upper Klamath Lake and the Sprague River.

- **Restoration Projects:** \$2 million will be granted to on-the-ground restoration projects that support the objectives listed on the 5-Year Plan. Possible projects are listed as well, although proposals need not be limited to those projects listed. Landowners and cooperators will be responsible for securing all applicable permits for the project. Signed agreements between private landowners and the Service will be required prior to funding. Project level monitoring should be included in these proposals
- **Research and Assessment:** \$350,000 will be granted to proposals that will provide information useful in advancing the objectives listed on the 5-Year Plan. Specific high priority research and assessment projects being sought are identified in Appendix 1. As the Service is developing a monitoring program to evaluate the efficacy of the Restoration Program, we are not seeking monitoring proposals this year.
- **Small Grants Partnership Program:** \$100,000 will be granted to small restoration projects (up to \$30,000 each) on private ownerships that address the recovery of federal



- trust species such as bull trout, Lost River and shortnose suckers, Oregon spotted frog and Applegate's milk vetch. Preference will be given to parties that cost-share with other restoration programs to leverage limited funds available for these types of activities. Other programs include those offered by the Bureau of Reclamation, Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Forest Service, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and others. Projects will be selected using the same criteria as the Hatfield Restoration Program (Appendix 6). USFWS contribution to the project is generally limited to less than 50% of the total cost. Proposers should complete the Pre-proposal for small restoration.

We are soliciting short Pre-proposals of less than two pages, for Restoration, Research and Assessment projects directed toward achieving the objectives and priority projects listed in the 5-Year Plan in Appendix 1. Proposals for funding of project maintenance, land acquisition, and mitigation will not be considered. Pre-proposals must be prepared in the format outlined in the enclosed Format for Pre-proposal (Appendix 2). Pre-proposals will be reviewed by the Science Team for potential merit in late November. Parties will be notified by December 5.

For those Pre-proposals that the Science Team has accepted, we will request Detailed Proposals (Appendix 3), due January 13, 2006. These will be reviewed and ranked by the Science Team in February, based on agreed-upon criteria (Ranking Criteria, Appendices 6 & 7). The prioritized list of proposals will then be reviewed by the Upper Klamath Basin Working Group, and their recommendation will go to the KBERO for a final decision on funding. If you have questions, please contact Dave Ross, KBERO Manager, at the above letterhead address or phone number.

Parties interested in submitting proposals should submit Pre-proposals electronically no later than **November 10, 2005** to the following email address: kfalls@fws.gov. If you do not have access to email capability, the pre-proposals must be submitted to the following address or postmarked by November 10, 2005:

2006 Restoration Proposals
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Klamath Basin Ecosystem Restoration Office
6610 Washburn Way
Klamath Falls, OR 97603

*****It should be recognized that, starting next year, fiscal year 2007, all submissions for funding consideration will need to be submitted electronically.***

Sincerely,

Curt Mullis
Field Supervisor

Attachment

**** IMPORTANT ****

Successful project proposers who are not private individuals must submit a SF-424, Application for Federal Assistance, and obtain and include a Dun and Bradstreet Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number with their project proposal. The DUNS number is a unique nine character identification number provided by the commercial company Dun & Bradstreet (D&B). Call D&B at 1-866-705-5711, if you do not have a DUNS number. The process to request a DUNS number takes about 10 minutes and is free of charge. Your project proposal will not be considered if a SF-424 is not included with your proposal.

If you are awarded funding by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, you will be required to register with the Central Contractor Registration (CCR) in order to do business with the Federal government. The CCR is the primary vendor database for the Department of Treasury. The CCR collects, validates, stores and disseminates data in support of agency missions. Vendors are required to complete a one-time registration to provide basic information relevant to procurement and financial transactions, and must update or renew their registration annually to maintain an active status. You may register online with CCR at: www.ccr.gov. Private individuals do not need to register with CCR or DUNS.

To obtain more information regarding Dun and Bradstreet Data Universal Numbering System or Central Contractor Registration, please contact Joni Drinkwater, Administrative Officer, by email at joni_drinkwater@fws.gov, or call (541) 885-8481.

APPENDIX 1. IDENTIFIED PROJECT NEEDS FOR LAKE AND RIVER RESTORATION

MATRIX OF 5-YEAR PLAN FOR LAKE RESTORATION

HATFIELD SCIENCE TEAM

Geographic Location A	Focus of Action B	Action C	5-yr Goal D	Relationship to Science Team Objectives E	Target Project Area F	Possible Projects G	Measurable Effects of Specific Project H	Desired Outcome I
Upper Klamath Lake & Agency Lake	Fish habitat provided by wetlands and related open-water areas	Reconnect wetlands to the lake, providing more natural (nonlinear) edges and large open water areas that may have lower internal nutrient load than the lake, and thus better water quality for fish	Reconnect Tulana, and [perhaps] other LWR Delta wetlands and Caledonia; planning process on other wetlands nearly complete	Large-scale improvements to habitats known to be important to suckers; net increase in water storage capacity of UKL	Lower Williamson Delta	Reconnect Tulana/Goose Bay portion of Delta to lakes and river	Large increase in wetland edge habitat for larval and juvenile suckers; large new open water areas for adult and juvenile suckers, possibly with better water quality than rest of lake during summer	Increased probability of successful sucker year-class formation; adult suckers use interior open water areas when water quality gets bad in UKL; assess impacts on algal growth
	Water quality improvements provided by wetlands	Restore historic wetlands	Restore wetlands adjacent to northeast and northwest UKL/15,000 A	Improve water quality, possibly increase humics released into the lake and decrease algae, increase juvenile fish habitat, understand the system better for adaptive mgmt	Lower Williamson Delta	Restore wetlands at Tulana/Goose Bay portion of Lower Williamson Delta, reconnecting to lakes and river, assess impact on algal growth	Wetlands at Tulana restored, impact on algal growth assessed	Decreased nutrient loading to UKL, possible increased humics to UKL, possible overall decreased severity of algal blooms
		Better utilize existing wetlands	Manage existing federally owned ranches to mimic natural wetland/lake interaction; 50,000 ft and 50,000 acres		Wood River Ranch	Manage return water to encourage wetland vegetation & increase juvenile fish habitat	Improved management of return water for wetland vegetation and juvenile fish habitat	Reduced nutrient load, potentially increased humics, increased juvenile fish habitat
						Adjust near-term WQ management if indicated	Reduce nutrients and potentially increase humics	Higher water quality refuge areas, more juvenile suckers
					Hanks' Marsh	Repair internal dike	Prior wetland restoration repaired so that it processes agricultural flow	Measurable reduction in nutrients and sediments

						Construct berms across channels to force return flow to go through marsh	Return flows forced through marsh	Measurable reduction in nutrients and sediments
		Construct treatment wetlands where appropriate	20 1-5 acre wetlands receiving irrigation runoff		Sevenmile	Separate west canal from the flow of Sevenmile so that fish keying into Wood River are not misdirected	100% of ag water flows into Wood River or Agency Lake (anywhere but Sevenmile)	Measurable increase in fish passage through Wood River
						Pilot Project: Develop treatment wetlands and adjust timing of discharges to reduce nutrient load; develop criteria for design and O&M of other treatment wetlands	2 pilot projects, 1-10 acres, 3 or more years of data	Measurable reduction in nutrients and sediments; criteria for other design and O&M
	Springs	Enhance springs in lake and re-introduce spawning populations of suckers	All springs restored, including Barkley and Harriman	Suckers successfully producing larvae from Barkley and Harriman springs; spawning habitat enhanced at other in-lake springs	Barkley Springs at Hagelstein Park	Reconstruct & enhance habitat for sucker spawning	Habitat reconstructed & enhanced	Springs are used by suckers for spawning again
					Harriman Spring	Restore habitat & reintroduce spawning groups	Spawning habitat enhanced as needed, suckers re-introduced	Harriman Spring again supports spawning for a self-perpetuating sucker population
	Action Items							
	Science Team input especially required							

MATRIX OF 5-YEAR PLAN FOR RIVER RESTORATION

HATFIELD SCIENCE TEAM

Geographic Location A	Focus of Action B	Action C	5-yr Goal D	Relationship to Science Team Objectives E	Potential Project Area (on public lands or with willing landowners) F	Possible Projects G	Measurable Effects of Specific Project H
Sprague River & Associated Springs & Tribs (flat valley bottoms above Beatty Gap highest priority for top-down restoration, water quality, and nutrient load reduction; flat valley bottoms below Beatty Gap, high priority for restoration benefits to sucker habitat, water quality, and nutrient load reduction; Springs and tributaries on valley floor high priorities for sucker habitat and water quality benefits)	Riparian / wetland management	Off-stream water supply	30 established	All riparian/wetland corridor along river channel in flat valley bottom has (1) vegetative recovery/maintenance; (2) upward trend for vegetation with strong roots (sedges, rushes, willows, etc.); (3) extensive riparian vegetation trapping sediments at high flows; (4) river/stream channel narrowing over time. This will measurably reduce suspended sediment and associated nutrient load, encourage channel narrowing which brings many water quality and fish habitat benefits, increases sub-irrigation of floodplain crops. In addition, landowner satisfaction with the program and participation in the program are high.	Willing landowners throughout system; additional criterion is an evaluation of whether channel manipulation is advisable as well or instead of vegetation mgmt (see '-' in research)	Grazing management plans with fencing and off-stream water supply as needed	Direct, measurable benefits to water quality, nutrient loading, and fish habitat. These projects will also, in conjunction with ongoing programmatic research, (a) allow relatively accurate prediction about the improvements in WQ and habitat and (b) provide a stronger basis for choosing among different management approaches.
		Grazing management	All of river corridor				
		Fencing	50% of river corridor, as appropriate				
	O&M (esp. of fencing)		Program in place for replacement, community-friendly monitoring, and weed control inside riparian fences		Throughout system	Develop a suite of more durable fencing design options	More durable fences; greater landowner satisfaction
						Crew for fencing O&M	95% of previously established riparian fencing is operating well, greater landowner satisfaction.
						Crew for weed control inside riparian corridor fences	Landowners have help controlling weed problems related to enhancement actions; greater landowner satisfaction
						Develop a plan for community-friendly monitoring	Fewer downed-fences and weed problems; greater landowner satisfaction.

		Enhance springs, especially large ones with ponds &/or channels	Inventory all large springs, measure water quality and super saturation. Enhance all large springs (appropriate vegetation on upward trend, channel dimensions limit warming, accessible to fish)	Measurable increase in sucker spawning and water quality in main river channel; decrease surface runoff; better understanding of role of springs in system	Choice of channel manipulation + riparian management or riparian management alone is site-specific.	Inventory all large springs with ponds and/or channels large enough for fish use; assess water quality and super saturation	Provide basis for prioritizing spring restoration
						Enhance springs, especially large ones with ponds and/or channels	Relatively rapid, measurable improvements to WQ, nutrient loading, and fish habitat will occur; As well, in conjunction with ongoing programmatic research, will allow (a) relatively accurate prediction about the improvements in WQ and habitat and (b) a stronger basis for choosing among different management approaches.
	Irrigation and water management	Eliminate surface return flows to river	Inventory all surface return flows, and identify all potential sites for treatment wetlands. Treat 50% of surface return flows.	Allows natural nutrient and sediment removal, reduces erosion and stream bank degradation, provides cooler return flows, and allows prioritization of projects.	Throughout system	Inventory all surface return flows	Provide basis for prioritizing areas to treat return flows
						Treat surface return flows.	Relatively rapid, measurable improvements to WQ, nutrient and thermal loading, and fish habitat; As well, in conjunction with ongoing programmatic research, will allow (a) relatively accurate prediction about the improvements in WQ and habitat and (b) a stronger basis for choosing among different mgmt approaches.
		Treatment wetlands	Construct 1 – several treatment wetlands. Measure effects of treatment wetlands; develop guidelines for successful development/management. Construct additional treatment wetlands where applicable.			Identify all potential sites for treatment wetlands	Provide basis for erotizing areas for treatment wetlands
						Construct treatment wetlands; measure effects	Relatively rapid, measurable improvements to WQ, nutrient loading, thermal conductivity and fish habitat; As well, in conjunction with ongoing programmatic research, will allow (a) relatively accurate prediction about the improvements in WQ and habitat and (b) a stronger basis for choosing among different mgmt approaches.
						Develop guidelines for successful development/manag ement of treatment wetlands	Provide basis for developing/managing successful treatment wetlands

		Improve water management so that stream flows approximate a more natural hydrograph.	Increase irrigation efficiencies to reduce withdrawals. Restore wetlands and riparian hydrologic functions.	Decrease nutrient loading from return flows. Keeps in stream flows higher and reduces overall impact to a streams hydrograph (i.e., flows more similar to natural hydrograph)	Sprague and Wood River primarily. Williamson secondarily.	Include projects that improve irrigation efficiencies	Generalized hydrogeomorphic principles, observation, and anecdotal evidence suggest that restoring ecosystem function restores stream flow to a more natural hydrograph through groundwater/surface water interactions. Reducing overall diversions also accomplishes this as well as reducing nutrient loading. These projects, properly monitored, in conjunction with ongoing programmatic research, will allow the quantification of these benefits.
Channel manipulation (e.g. channel realignment, narrowing, earth-moving projects)	Main river channel and tributaries	Clear guidelines established for where and when manipulation is appropriate, based on results of assessments and monitoring of implemented projects.	Manipulation of channels where appropriate	When appropriate, this approach can have the most rapid effect on channel morphology and its functionality for fish habitat, water quality, etc.	Existing channel modification projects	See Research Table	Essential to help make decisions about when and where these types of projects should be constructed to improve fish habitat & water quality
	Springs	All large springs re-connected to river, spawning/refuge habitat improved or maintained. (Note: as evaluation is ongoing, these could be reprioritized.)		Measurable benefits for both water quality and fish habitat	Choice of channel manipulation and riparian management techniques is site-specific. For diked reaches, channel manipulation is likely the only option.	Re-connect large springs to river for fish use, improve spawning/refuge habitat	Measurable increase in sucker spawning in springs; localized WQ improvement in main river channel; decrease surface runoff; better understanding of role of springs in system

	Improve Fish Passage	Fish screens and ladders at diversion dams	All diversions presently impeding or blocking fish passage.	Ensure suckers can reach areas with suitable habitat	Throughout system	Fish screens at diversions, ladders at diversion dams	Ensure suckers can reach areas with suitable habitat
		Remove Chiloquin Dam	Removal is accomplished.	Improved access to Sprague River habitats, improve downriver spawning habitat, eliminate reservoir habitat for non-native predators.	Chiloquin Dam	Remove Chiloquin dam	Ensure suckers can reach areas with suitable habitat, restore natural sediment dynamics important for downstream spawning gravel, eliminate reservoir habitat for non-native predators.
Wood River Valley and Lost River (prioritize Wood River Valley [WRV] as most likely area for successful sucker re-introduction, WRV also has high potential for nutrient loading reduction to UKL)	Re-introduce suckers	Develop and implement re-introduction plan	Re-introduction program underway. Planning completed, 3-4 years of actual re-introduction accomplished	Move towards sucker recovery by establishing more populations, taking advantage of existing higher quality habitat, begin learning how to do it.	Sevenmile Creek, Wood River and tributaries	Develop plan for proper genetic management and logistics	Manage intended and unintended consequences of re-introduction
						Confine adults ready to spawn in areas with suitable habitat	Implementing re-introduction plan may successfully re-establish suckers in Wood River system. (Life cycle dictates that evaluating success will take years, because many adults won't return to spawn for the first time until they are 5-7 years old.) Requires strong monitoring component.
						Out-plant embryos or larvae	
	Irrigation management	Eliminate surface return flows to rivers and lake	Inventory all surface return flows, and Treat 50% of surface return flows.	Reducing nutrient loading to Agency Lake may help decrease biomass of algae. In Lost River, will improve water quality for all sucker life stages.	Throughout system	Reduce surface return flows to canal system and streams	Localized improvement in water quality, overall reduction in nutrient loading to aquatic systems already over-burdened with nutrients
		Treatment wetlands	Identify all potential sites for treatment wetlands. Construct 1 – several pilot Measure effects of		Wood River Valley, Lost River System	Identify all potential sites for treatment wetlands	Provide basis for prioritizing where to develop treatment wetlands

			treatment wetlands; develop guidelines for successful development/management. Where appropriate, construct additional treatment wetlands.			Measure effects of treatment wetlands, develop guidelines for successful development/management	Provide basis for developing/managing successful treatment wetlands
						Develop treatment wetlands for return flows along Lost River	Relatively rapid, measurable improvements to WQ, nutrient loading, and temperature
						Develop treatment wetlands for return flows into Sevenmile Canal	
						Pump lake water for irrigation and for seasonal wetlands establishment	
	Improve Fish Passage	Fish screens and ladders at diversion dams	All diversions presently impeding or blocking fish passage.	Ensure suckers can reach areas with suitable habitat	Throughout system	Where appropriate	Ensure suckers can reach areas with suitable habitat
	This used to be called "high priority" but that may run afoul of Jim's and others' desire not to tilt things too far in the direction of a few favored projects. What do you want to call the 'peat' category?						
	Really needs work/data						

MATRIX OF 5-YEAR RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT NEEDS FOR WETLAND AND RIVER RESTORATION.

<i>Needs</i>	<i>Where</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Tells You</i>	<i>Matters Because</i>
Dynamics and inter-relationships among internal/external P loading/algal biomass/water quality/fish stress	Upper Klamath and Agency Lakes	Ongoing in part, need more	How large a reduction in external and internal P loading is required to reduce algal biomass to the point that water quality stress to suckers is reduced	Determines priority for projects (raise or lower the priority of P-reducing projects); establishes realistic P reduction targets and time scales
Nutrient & water quality dynamics of former lake-edge wetlands under various mgmt options (w/ and w/o breaching)	Wood River Ranch; Agency Lake/Barnes; Caledonia; Williamson Delta		Ramifications of breaching dikes around former wetlands (extent of restored wetlands, WQ in open water areas, influence on lake, etc.) relative to alternative management schemes within dikes.	
Non-native predator responses to reconnecting former wetlands to UKL (perch, bass, fathead minnows)	TNC site		Whether colonization of reconnected habitats by non-native predators overwhelms other benefits to suckers	Re-evaluate benefits of TNC (and adjacent) restoration
Influence of humic releases from wetlands on algal production	Upper Klamath/Agency lakes	Ongoing, need more	Magnitude of the spatial and temporal effect of wetland-generated humics on biomass and species composition of the algal community, and the related water quality	If it does reduce algal growth, likely would shift priority towards restoration of more lacustrine wetlands; establish realistic expectations about the magnitude of the effect

Assess reduction of nutrient load through treatment wetlands and timing of discharge	Sevenmile Canal; Sprague Valley		How much nitrogen and phosphorus can be removed from agricultural and pasture land runoff	Sets priority for actions aimed at reducing nutrient loading; establish realistic expectations about the magnitude of the effect
Hydrodynamic study	Upper Klamath and Agency lakes	Ongoing, should be extended to Agency Lake	How wind affects circulation patterns and vertical mixing in Upper Klamath and Agency Lakes	Important for determining in-lake transport processes that ultimately provide insight into lake water quality and ecosystem response
Nutrient/sediment loading to the Sprague River		Ongoing in part, needs to be expanded	Whether the nutrient and sediment sources to the Sprague River (and to UKL) are being reduced by restoration measures	Guides location and type of projects, and generates realistic expectations about the effects of projects
Continuous water quality monitoring network throughout Sprague			Temperature, oxygen, pH	Establishes baseline conditions and effects of restoration
Bathymetry	Sprague Valley	18 miles done, need more	Topography of the river channel	Used to plan and design river restoration projects and to evaluate active and passive restoration on river morphology which is an indicator habitat for aquatic organisms
Continue Sprague assessment; develop guidelines for appropriate approaches to restoration projects based on Sprague assessments (USGS/UO & GMA reports)	Sprague Valley	Ongoing, second phase of USGS/UO study imminent; GMA's report by Dec 2005	Geomorphological conditions in the Sprague River and lower Sycan River	Certain geomorphic conditions are more conducive to either active or passive restoration. Some areas are higher risk for active restoration.

Bench scale P	Sprague Valley	USGS, NRCS, and the Klamath Tribes team to analyze existing data & develop proposal for detailed analysis of P sources & sinks in Sprague. USGS lead	P sources by location & soil type in Sprague and Sycan	Sets priority by soil type; the USGS study will go well beyond an evaluation of soil type
LiDAR	Sycan from Coyote Bucket to Torrent Spring	Done for Sprague & Sycan river valleys, need above Sycan	This is a tool for restoration work, both evaluating sites and designing restoration projects.	
Progress Report annual or biannual (see Research Section narrative above)			What is working and what is not; should begin with a comprehensive review of existing projects	Guides future management choices, facilitates adaptive mgmt on current projects, and provides for public accountability
Sprague River sediment bed load study			Sediment bed load study of the Sprague	Provides information on the sources and locations of bed load to provide baseline info and guide restoration
Feasibility assessment for removal of organics	between Link R dam and Keno		Alternatives for organic matter removal to improve water quality in Keno Reservoir and in Klamath River downstream	Poor water quality resulting from high organic matter results in low survival of fish

Riparian vegetation response to channel and floodplain morphology, hydrology, and soils	Sprague Valley	Gap in the ongoing Sprague assessments	Why similar management actions produce different vegetative responses in different places, and how to plan projects to achieve the desired vegetative response	Frames the geomorphic and hydrologic understanding of the Sprague in terms of riparian vegetation, which is the primary source of bank stability and the agent through which long-term channel narrowing will occur. This is the final link in the assessment chain.
Riparian vegetation monitoring	Sprague Valley	Not included in FWS monitoring planning to date	Define potential natural communities throughout the Sprague Valley; track vegetative and bank stability response to management and climate across range of geomorphic types	Vegetation is arguably the single most important response variable in restoring the Sprague River. We must know what the trends are, where projects are working, where they are not
Updated thermal infrared radiometry (measures surface water temperature, helps ID groundwater inflows, irrigation return flows, effects of tributaries)	Sprague R system		Water temperature of Sprague River, tributaries, irrigation return flows, and groundwater accretions during summer	Identifies baseline temperature conditions and priority areas for restoration.

APPENDIX 2

PRE-PROPOSAL FORMAT FOR RESTORATION, DESIGN, RESEARCH, AND ASSESSMENT PROJECTS

INSTRUCTIONS:

Refer to Table 1 to determine whether a Pre-proposal is needed. Complete the Pre-proposal using the format outlined in this section. Pre-proposals should be 2 pages or less using 12 font and 1-inch margins and printed on 8.5 x 11 inch white paper.

Information requested on this application may be subject to release to the general public. Your submission of an application for federal funds from the Hatfield Restoration Program authorizes the release of appropriate application information.

Table 1. Decision Matrix for Hatfield Restoration Program Proposals

<i>Project Type</i>	<i>Pre-Proposal</i>	<i>Detailed Proposal (if Pre-proposal approved)</i>
Restoration Project Design	Yes	Yes
Single Phase Restoration Project (more than \$30,000)	Yes	Yes
Restoration Project Implementation (of design previously approved)	Intent to submit, with budget (placeholder)	Yes (the proposal <i>is</i> the design)
Additional phase of restoration project if it is similar to first phase	Intent to submit, with budget	Yes
Research/Assessment	Yes	Yes
Monitoring	Not asking for any monitoring (except w/in project)	
Small Grant < \$30,000.00	Yes	Yes

1. Project Title

Use a descriptive title which identifies the geographic area of the project.

2. Project Proposer

Identify who is submitting this proposal (agency, tribe, etc.) and be sure to identify the contact person (name, title, address, phone, email).

3. Project Location

Describe the location of your proposal (e.g. Sprague River, River Mile 14, Williamson River Delta). Provide legal description including Township, Range, Section.

4. Project Description

Describe the type of project you are proposing (e.g., wetland restoration, spring restoration, design for river restoration, research). Is it a project identified in the 5-Year Plan?

State the project objectives (e.g., fence 12 miles of stream, remove 2 culverts, create 6 step pools to improve fish access to springs).

Describe study design, project implementation approach.

Reference watershed assessments, Sucker Recovery plan, National Academy of Science Report and other applicable documents where possible.

5. Landowner Participation

How is the landowner/property manager involved with the project?

Is the owner involved with other stewardship programs?

What is the landowner's cost-share (include in-kind contributions)?

6. Conservation Easement

Is there a conservation easement on a part of the property?

Is the landowner potentially interested in a conservation easement?

7. Cost-sharing

Is there a cost-share?

Identify sources and amounts.

8. Cooperators

Are there cooperators (groups or other entities that will oversee project completion)?

Who are they?

9. Budget

Provide a budget including matching and in-kind contributions.

10. Design Proposals:

Describe the expertise, experience of the designers.

Identify similar projects completed and references.

APPENDIX 3

FORMAT FOR DETAILED RESTORATION, RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT PROJECT PROPOSALS

INSTRUCTIONS:

If your Pre-proposal was approved, complete the attached summary sheet (Appendix 5) and include it as a cover for your proposal. If you have letterhead stationery, please use it only on the transmittal letter for the package. You must follow the format outlined in this section or your proposal will not be considered. Use separate pages for the cover and budget sections of the proposal and supporting material, such as maps, pictures, and drawings. Proposals and supporting material must be printed on 8.5 x 11 inch white paper, 12-font with 1-inch margins. Projects in more than one location should be presented in separate proposals. Be brief. Keep it short and to the point.

Information requested on this application may be subject to release to the general public. Your submission of an application for federal funds from the Hatfield Restoration Program authorizes the release of appropriate application information. Many people will be reviewing this proposal and their levels of expertise about your particular project will vary. Try to anticipate and answer questions.

1. Project Title

Use a descriptive title which identifies the geographic area of the project.

2. Project Proposer

Identify who is submitting this proposal (agency, tribe, etc.) and be sure to identify the contact person. Attach a Resume or other description of the education and experience of the persons responsible for project implementation (e.g. project manager, contractor).

3. Program Information

Summarize information about the problem that the project is designed to address. Place the project in context: What are the priorities for that area and the probability of providing measurable benefits (if applicable)?

4. Background

Provide enough background information to bring the Science Team up to date on the need for this project. This will assist them in ranking your proposal.

5. Project Objective(s)

State the objectives of your proposal in complete sentences. It is important that your project addresses the Goals and Objectives listed in the 5-Year Plan (Appendix 1). (Remember, Goals are general statements, Objectives are measurable tasks that can be quantified.)

6. Tasks

State the specific actions which must be taken to achieve the project objectives.

7. Methods

Provide study design. Describe all sampling, analytical, planning, and construction procedures for each objective as appropriate. Include details on methods and techniques, equipment and facilities, data collection, statistical analyses, and quality assurance procedures, and describe the criteria to be used for hypothesis testing. Describe the approach to minimizing or considering external factors that are not controllable, but which may influence the ability of the project to evaluate the hypothesis. Clearly identify how your approach maximized the information richness and value to decision-makers.

8. Specific Work Products

Identify specific deliverable results of the project. Normally, project managers will be required to submit annual and final project reports.

9. Project Duration

- a. Identify project duration from the beginning of project through submittal of a final report. Note that duration of a project funded from Fiscal Year 2005 appropriations may extend beyond the end of the fiscal year.
- b. Identify points at which decisions could logically be made to modify or terminate a project.
- c. Provide a detailed project schedule to include:
 - Initiation of project.
 - Completion date for each milestone or major task.
 - Submittal dates for reports.

10. Permits

Landowners, Cooperators, and/or land management agencies are required to secure any federal, state, and local land use permits necessary to implement the project including Clean Water Act Sections 401 and 404 permits, California Streambed Alteration Agreements or Oregon Division of State Lands permits. Compliance with Sections 7 and 10 of the Endangered Species Act, and the National Historic Preservation Act, as well as Department of the Interior regulations on hazardous substance determinations is required. Project site surveys will be required in order to comply with these regulations. You should include the results of any completed archaeological or biological surveys in your proposal package. If surveys have not been completed, you may have to incorporate the cost of a survey into your proposal budget.

Necessary permits and landowner permission will be required prior to finalization of an agreement. Evidence of permits and landowner permission must be provided to the Klamath Basin Ecosystem Restoration Office.

11. Landowner Participation

Provide the name and phone number of each landowner involved in the proposal. Indicate how landowners will participate in the project.

12. Data Handling and Storage

Describe how the data and other information will be handled, stored, and made accessible.

13. Cost-Sharing

The Hatfield Group and KBERO realize that we can make our restoration dollars go further if other sources are found to match our investments. Seek other contributions and show these in your proposal. Indicate if these contributions are state or federal matches. Also indicate other funding sources to which you have applied, or plan to apply during this year, to match this project.

14. Budget

Provide a detailed budget for the project. Detail how matching or in-kind contributions are determined. In-kind contributions may include donated labor, materials, or equipment. Other contributions are those funds contributed to the project from other funding sources. Those projects with greater amounts of matching funds have a greater chance of receiving funding. Successful proposals will be funded from Fiscal Year 2006 appropriations only, and funding in future fiscal years is expected to be subject to annual competition. Administrative overhead should not exceed 15 percent. Project costs, qualifying in-kind and other contributions must be incurred only during project implementation and must be directly tied to the overall project costs. All costs must be supported by appropriate invoices. The detailed budget should include line entries as described in the attached Estimated Budget Worksheet (Appendix 4). The Budget portion of your proposal will be carefully reviewed. Be sure that all costs are presented as described above, and all computations are accurate.

15. Project Location

- a. Map: Include a U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5 minute quad, including the quad name, and mark the project location on the map.
- b. Legal Description: Provide all applicable Township, Range, Section, and Quarter Sections containing the project location.
- c. Watershed: Identify the smallest stream tributary and watershed(s) where the project will occur. Example: Jack Creek, tributary of the Sprague River.
- d. Habitat Description: A brief description of the habitat at the site and within the watershed (e.g., second and third growth Ponderosa pine forest.)
- e. Land Use: A brief description of the land use history and the current land use at the site and within the watershed (e.g., historically used for timber production, currently used for cattle grazing.)

16. Other Partners/Cooperators

Identify all partners and explain the extent of their participation in the project.

17. Performance Plan

Proposals should include a plan to monitor project effectiveness or performance evaluation (if applicable). The plan should include a list of project-specific performance measures that will be used to assess project success in relation to the goals and objectives, and should detail how the performance measures will be quantified for reviewers to effectively evaluate the performance evaluation plan. For most types of projects, project success is determined by measuring activities, outputs, and outcomes.

18. Literature Cited

All research and monitoring proposals should include references to related research studies, project reports, scientific reports, and other supporting information cited in the proposal.

19. Land Management Plan

Describe how the landowner(s) plans to utilize the project area during the term of the agreement (e.g., grazing strategy in project area including season of use, number and types of livestock, watering strategy, water management regimes for wetland restoration).

20. Project Summary

Attach a completed Summary Sheet (Appendix 5).

APPENDIX 4

ESTIMATED BUDGET WORKSHEET

	<i>TOTAL BUDGET</i>	<i>USFWS Funds Requested</i>	<i>Other Federal Funds</i>	<i>Non-Federal Cost Share</i>	
				<i>Cash</i>	<i>In-Kind</i>
1) Personnel: Position, # Hours @ Hourly Rate					
Subtotal Personnel	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
2) Subcontractors: # Hours @ Hourly Rate					
Subtotal Subcontractors	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
3) Materials and Supplies: #Units@ Cost/Unit					
Subtotal Materials and Supplies	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
4) Operating Expenses:					
Subtotal Operating Expenses	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
SUBTOTAL DIRECT COSTS	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
5) Administrative Overhead Expenses:	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
% Administrative Overhead	%	%			
% Cost Share:	%	%			

APPENDIX 5
HATFIELD RESTORATION PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 2006
PROJECT SUMMARY SHEET

1. PROJECT TITLE:
2. PROPOSER/ORGANIZATION:
3. ADDRESS:
4. CITY:
5. STATE:
6. ZIP CODE:
7. CONTACT PERSON:
8. TELEPHONE NUMBER: Office -
 Home -
 Fax -
9. PROJECT OBJECTIVE:
10. FUNDING REQUESTED:
11. COST SHARE FUNDS or IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS:
12. LOCATION (Sub-basin; USGS Quad; Township, Range, Section)
13. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND SPECIES BENEFITED:
14. PARTNERS/COOPERATORS:

APPENDIX 6

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR RESTORATION PROJECTS REVISED FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Criteria For Pre-Proposal

1. Relevance to Objectives presented in Column E of the 5-Year Plan
2. Cost/benefit (includes cooperator inputs and demonstration and research benefits)
3. Landowner Commitment

Criteria For Proposal

1. Relevance to objectives presented in column E of the 5-Year Plan
2. Cost/benefit (includes cooperator inputs and demonstration & research benefits)
3. Landowner Commitment
4. Supported by adequate assessment
5. Expectations are adequate and realistic
6. Compatibility with adjacent land use/project
7. Effectiveness of technical design
8. Ability to successfully implement
9. Lack of adverse effects
10. Synergistic effects with other actions
11. Low risk of project failure
12. Low cost of project failure
13. Responsiveness to Pre-proposal feedback

Additional Criteria for Design Proposals:

14. Effectiveness of site assessment methodology to prepare for design work
15. Process for obtaining permits

APPENDIX 7

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT PROJECTS

Generally, research and assessment proposals must advance knowledge in such a way that decrease uncertainties associated with designing and implementing restoration projects. Monitoring projects must be efficiently designed to quantify environmental indicators and changes associated with restoration. Criteria used for project evaluation include:

1. Relevance to Goals and Objectives outlined in the 5-Year Plan
2. Clearly stated purpose, hypothesis (for research proposals) and objectives
3. Methods are adequate to meet purpose and objectives, and to enable conclusive statements regarding the hypothesis (for research proposals)
4. Results are likely to decrease key uncertainties and/or quantify changes in key response variables:
 - a) At appropriate spatial and temporal scales
 - b) At adequate levels of accuracy and precision
5. Overall value of products
 - a) Accessibility and usefulness to decision-makers and other scientists
 - b) Collaborative, inter-disciplinary approach enhances public acceptance
6. Capabilities of project team:
 - a) Qualifications and track record
 - b) Ability to complete the project
7. Cost/benefit assessment (cost is reasonable and adequate for the work proposed, relative to the expected benefits)